arXiv:1702.01307v1 [math.AP] 4 Feb 2017

OPTIMIZING THE FIRST DIRICHLET EIGENVALUE OF THE LAPLACIAN WITH AN OBSTACLE

ANTOINE HENROT AND DAVIDE ZUCCO

Abstract. Inside a fixed bounded domain Ω of the plane, we look for the best compact connected set K, of given perimeter, in order to *maximize* the first Dirichlet eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K)$. We discuss some of the qualitative properties of the maximizers, passing toward existence, regularity and geometry. Then we study the problem in specific domains: disks, rings, and, more generally, disks with several holes. In these situations, we prove symmetry and, in some cases non symmetry results, identifying the explicit solution.

We choose to work with the *outer Minkowski content* as the "good" notion of perimeter. Therefore, we are led to prove some new properties for it as its lower semicontinuity with respect to the Hausdorff convergence and the fact that the outer Minkowski content is equal to the Hausdorff lower semicontinuous envelope of the classical perimeter.

AMS subject classifications. 28A75, 35P15, 49Q10, 49Q15.

1. Introduction

A shape optimization problem is composed by three prime ingredients: the cost functional, the class of admissible sets and the constraints. One also has to decide whether to tackle the minimization problem or the maximization problem. Often, only one of these is relevant.

A well studied cost functional is the one which models the principal frequency of vibration of a membrane. A shape optimization problem for this quantity has a long history going back at least to 1877 when Lord Rayleigh observed and conjectured that among all membranes of given area, the disk has the minimum principal frequency. This conjecture was solved by Faber in 1923 and, independently, by Krahn in 1924, and many other contributions to similar problems for the principal frequency continued during the 20th century, see [13]. In 1963 Hersch, through the work of Payne and Weinberger [23], proved that of all doubly connected membranes of given area and perimeter, the ring has the maximal principal frequency (see [16, 17] and also Theorem 4.1 of this paper for the precise statement).

The principal frequency of a membrane fixed along its boundary is mathematically described by the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian λ_1 of a bounded domain Ω in the plane with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$. In this paper we discuss various shape optimization problems in the plane for the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian with Dirichlet boundary conditions on a domain with an *obstacle*: inside a given bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ our goal is to find the best compact set K (the obstacle) so as to optimize the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the open set $\Omega \setminus K$, namely

$$\mathrm{opt}\{\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K) :\ K \subset \overline{\Omega},\ K \text{ closed and subjects to additional constraints}\}.$$

We recall the variational characterization of $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K)$ as the minimum of the Rayleigh quotient among all non zero functions in the Sobolev space $H^1_0(\Omega \setminus K)$. Therefore, we are imposing the Dirichlet condition over a supplementary region K (of possibly positive measure), and we look for the best obstacle, both in shape and location, which optimizes this eigenvalue. Similar problems in this spirit were tackled by Ramm and Shivakumar in [24], Harrel, Kröger and Kurata in [12], Kesavan in [19], and by El Soufi and Kiwan in [9]. However, in these papers the authors considered obstacles of *fixed* shape, trying to optimize the first eigenvalue by means of *rigid motions*, translating or rotating the obstacle. Of course the results that can be obtained, dealing with a wider class of admissible obstacles, whose shapes are possibly varying, are weaker than those obtained in the previous papers and it is hopeless to expect a universal solution (in general the shape and the location of an optimal obstacle depends on the domain Ω). More recently, Tilli and Zucco have treated in [26, 27] a related problem for the first eigenvalue of an elliptic operator in divergence form, in the class of one dimensional obstacles (i.e., sets of finite one dimensional Hausdorff measure).

We start introducing four relevant problems for the first Dirichlet eigenvalue, depending on the type of optimization (minimization or maximization) and the kind of constraint (area or perimeter); the class of admissible sets will be chosen accordingly to guarantee existence. Then, in the rest of the paper, we focus on the last of these four problems.

Problem 1: minimizing the first eigenvalue with an obstacle of fixed area. For a fixed $A \in (0, \mathcal{L}(\Omega))$, with $\mathcal{L}$ the Lebesgue measure, consider the problem

$$\min\{\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K) :\ K \subset \overline{\Omega},\ K \text{ closed},\ \mathcal{L}(K) = A\}. \tag{1}$$

This problem is strictly related to the minimization of the first eigenvalue for domains contained in a *box*, which has been analyzed for example in [13, Section 3.4]. Indeed, setting $C = \Omega \setminus K$, problem (1) becomes equivalent to the minimization of $\lambda_1(C)$ among open sets $C \subseteq \Omega$ of area $\mathcal{L}(\Omega) - A$, where Ω plays the role of a box containing all possible competitors. Therefore, from what is known for minimizer contained into a box (see Theorem 3.4.1 of [13]), one can recover existence of a minimizer K_{opt} of (1) and some of its qualitative properties: if the parameter A is chosen so that inside Ω

- there are disks of area $\mathcal{L}(\Omega) - A$, then K_{opt} is the complement in Ω of a disk of area $\mathcal{L}(\Omega) - A$ (this is a consequence of the Faber-Krahn inequality) and in particular, there is (in general) no uniqueness of the minimizer of (1);
- there are no disks of area $\mathcal{L}(\Omega) - A$, then K_{opt} touches the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and the free parts of the boundary of K_{opt} (i.e., those which are inside Ω) are analytic, see [3], moreover these free parts do not contain any arc of circle, see [14].

Problem 2: maximizing the first eigenvalue with an obstacle of fixed area. The corresponding *maximization* problem of (1) has no solutions. Indeed one can construct a family of closed sets K_n of fixed area A so as the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_n) \uparrow \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ (for instance take K_n as the union of a fixed closed set of area A and a curve γ_n filling Ω as n increases, see [26, 27] where the limit distribution in $\overline{\Omega}$ of these sets is studied in detail). To have existence of a maximizer one needs to require stronger geometrical and topological constraints in the class of

admissible obstacles, preventing maximizing sequences to spread out over Ω (notice that connectedness is still not sufficient). Therefore, we are led to formulate the following problem: for a fixed $A \in (0, \mathcal{L}(\Omega))$

$$\max\{\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K) : K \subset \overline{\Omega},\ K \text{ closed and convex},\ \mathcal{L}(K) = A\}. \tag{2}$$

The existence of a maximizer in the class of convex sets is straightforward (see [4, 13]). Moreover, as convexity seems necessary for the existence, it is natural to expect every solution in (2) to *saturate* the convexity constraint, in the sense that its boundary should contain non-strictly convex parts. In particular it could be interesting to know whether this problem has only polygonal sets as solutions, see [20], [21] for results in this direction for shape optimization problems with convexity constraints.

Problem 3: minimizing the first eigenvalue with an obstacle of fixed perimeter. Also the corresponding minimization problem of (1) with the constraint on the perimeter (i.e., one dimensional Hausdorff measure of the boundary) has no solutions, since one can construct a family of closed sets K_n of fixed perimeter L so as the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_n) \downarrow \lambda_1(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$ (for instance take K_n so as its boundary ∂K_n is a closed curve with fixed perimeter converging, as n increases, to a subset Γ of $\partial\Omega$). Therefore, as in Problem 2 we are forced to restrict the class of admissible obstacles to convex sets and we formulate the following problem: for a fixed $L \in (0, \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega))$

$$\min\{\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K) : K \subset \overline{\Omega},\ K \text{ closed and convex},\ \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K) = L\}, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^1$ denotes the one dimensional Hausdorff measure (if Ω is not regular $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega) = \infty$ by convention). Now, even in this smaller class of admissible obstacles the existence question is not so clear. For example, if the boundary of Ω contains a segment and if L is small enough (smaller than twice the length of the segment), it is still possible to build a minimizing sequence of convex domains K_n approaching the boundary of Ω and so that $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_n) \downarrow \lambda_1(\Omega)$. On the other hand, if L is large enough, existence of a minimizer is straightforward since minimizing sequences will not be able to converge to a segment. In any case, one expects maximizers of (3) touching the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

Problem 4: maximizing the first eigenvalue with an obstacle of fixed perimeter. This is the problem that we analyze in detail in this paper. The first issue is to introduce a good notion of perimeter. Indeed, since objects of positive capacity but zero Lebesgue measure influence the first eigenvalue but are not seen by the classical perimeter (as defined by De Giorgi), we need to choose another notion of perimeter more sensitive to one-dimensional objects. Moreover, it is natural to ask that this notion of perimeter

(a) coincides with the classical notion of perimeter on *regular* sets;
(b) is continuous (or at least lower semicontinuous) for Hausdorff convergence. In particular, this perimeter measures twice the length of one dimensional objects.

The first point allows to work with a natural object and to use several well known results available on the classical perimeter. The second one is also natural to get the existence result and will rule out some competitors (for example it penalizes segments). To these purposes we choose to work with the *outer Minkowski content*

(see for instance [1, 28] where this quantity is studied in detail): for a closed set K in $\overline{\Omega}$, whenever the limit exits, we define

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K) := \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\epsilon \setminus K)}{\epsilon}, \tag{4}$$

where $K^\epsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : d(x,K) \le \epsilon\}$ is the tubular neighborhood of K through the distance function $d(\cdot,K)$ to K. According to this definition, the outer Minkowski content of any closed set in $\overline{\Omega}$ with Lipschitz boundary coincides with the De Giorgi perimeter $\mathcal{P}$ and with the Hausdorff measure of the boundary (see [1, Corollary 1]):

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K) = P(K) = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K). \tag{5}$$

Moreover, the outer Minkowski content of any closed n-rectifiable set K in $\overline{\Omega}$ (namely the image of a closed set of the plane through a Lipschtzian map) reduces to twice the more classical *Minkowski content* $\mathcal{M}^1$, and this coincides with the Hausdorff measure (see [11, p. 275]):

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K) = 2\mathcal{M}^1(K) = 2\mathcal{H}^1(K). \tag{6}$$

The lower semicontinuity of the outer Minkowski content with respect to some convergence is more tricky. We address Section 2 to this aim, since this result is interesting on its own and, to the best of our knowledge, new (we do not found a proof in the literature but we adapt some ideas developed in [6] for the so-called density perimeter). As a consequence of this result we answer to a question posed by Cerf in [7], about the characterization of the *Hausdorff lower semicontinuous envelope of the perimeter*.

Now, for a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with Lipschitz boundary and for a fixed $L \in (0, \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega))$ we study the maximization problem

$$\max\{\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K) :\ K \subseteq \overline{\Omega},\ K \text{ continuum},\ \mathcal{SM}^1(K) \le L\}, \tag{7}$$

where, as usual, the word *continuum* (continua for the plural) stands for a compact, connected and non empty set. Notice that the admissible class of obstacles is very wide: a generic obstacle can be splitted into two pieces, a part of positive Lebesgue measure (*the body*) and a part of null Lebesgue measure (*the tentacles*). Here connectedness of the admissible obstacles combined with the perimeter constraint, prevents maximizing sequences to spread out over Ω and it is sufficient for the existence a solution (compare with Problem 2). Moreover the assumption $L < \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega)$, prevents to have non trivial solutions, otherwise by (5) one could take $K = \overline{\Omega}$ and $\lambda_1(\emptyset) = \infty$. Notice that we prefer to work with an inequality constraint on the perimeter, even though, in the case of equality constraint, existence holds as well.

In Section 3, we discuss some of the qualitative properties of the maximizers of (7), passing toward existence, regularity and geometry. Clearly any solution of (7) depends on the geometry of the domain Ω and this is the reason why it is hard to find explicit solutions. However when the geometry of Ω has a specific form, namely when it is a disk, a ring, or more generally, a disk with several holes, we are able to go beyond qualitative results: in Section 4 we prove symmetry and, in some cases non symmetry results, identifying the explicit solution for certain values of the constraint (actually for all values when the domain is itself a disk). It is worth mentioning that when Ω is a ring appears the not so common phenomenon of *symmetry breaking*: for certain values of the constraint every maximizer is not radially symmetric.

Aknowledgements. The work of Antoine Henrot is supported by the project ANR-12-BS01-0007-01-OPTIFORM *Optimisation de formes* financed by the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR). The work of Davide Zucco is supported by the project 2015 *Fenomeni Critici nella Meccanica dei Materiali: un Approccio Variazionale* financed by the INdAM-GNAMPA. This work has been developed at the Institut Élie Cartan de Lorraine and at the Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati di Trieste: these institutions are kindly acknowledged for their warm hospitality.

2. On the lower semicontinuity of the outer Minkowski content

We prove that the outer Minkowski content defined in (4) is lower semicontinuous with respect to the Hausdorff convergence. To prove this result we adapt some ideas developed in [6] that were tailored for the so-called density perimeter (actually they also apply to the classical Minkowski content). As a consequence of this result we answer to a question posed by Cerf in [7], about the characterization of the Hausdorff lower semicontinuous envelope of the perimeter. These results are, to the best of our knowledge, new.

Lemma 2.1. *For a given continuum K in $\mathbb{R}^2$ there exists a sequence of continua $\{K_n\}$ consisting of a finite union of segments converging to K in the Hausdorff distance as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. We recall the construction given in the proof of [6, Theorem 4.1]). Take a covering of K given by open disks of radius $1/n$. By compactness the covering can be provided by a finite number of disks. Moreover, by connectedness this family of open disks can be considered connected. Then define the continuum K_n as the family of all the segments connecting any two centers of those disks of this covering with non-empty intersection. By definition K_n satisfied what claimed by the lemma. □

We will need the following characterization of the outer Minkowski content.

Lemma 2.2. *Let K be a continuum in $\overline{\Omega}$. Then the limit in* (4) *always exists and*

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K) = \sup_{\epsilon>0} \left[\frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\epsilon \setminus K)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon \right]. \tag{8}$$

Proof. To prove (8) it is sufficient to show that the quantity inside the sup is non-increasing with respect to ϵ, namely that for every $0 < \epsilon < \delta$

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\delta \setminus K)}{\delta} - \pi\delta \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\epsilon \setminus K)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon. \tag{9}$$

We prove (9) by an approximation argument. By Lemma 2.1 there exists a sequence of continua $\{K_n\}$ consisting of a finite union of segments converging to K in the Hausdorff distance. Therefore, from [6, Lemma 4.1] for every set K_n of the approximating sequence the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K_n^\delta \setminus K_n)}{\delta} - \pi\delta \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}(K_n^\epsilon \setminus K_n)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon.$$

In particular, by the continuity of the measure on increasing sequences of sets, for a fixed $\eta > 0$ there exists $\mu \in (0, \epsilon)$ so that

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K_n^\delta \setminus K_n^\mu)}{\delta} - \pi\delta \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}(K_n^\epsilon \setminus K_n^\mu)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon + \eta. \tag{10}$$

Now, by definition of the Hausdorff distance, there exists n_μ such that $K_n \subset K^\mu$ and $K \subset K_n^\mu$ for every $n > n_\mu$. Then $K_n^\epsilon \subset K^{\mu+\epsilon}$, and (10) becomes

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K_n^\delta \setminus K_n^\mu)}{\delta} - \pi\delta \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}(K^{\mu+\epsilon} \setminus K)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon + \eta. \tag{11}$$

Using again the definition of the Hausdorff distance, for all ξ and θ with $0 < \mu < \xi < \theta < \delta$, there exists $n_{\xi,\theta}$ such that $K^\theta \subset K_n^\delta$ and $K_n^\mu \subset K^\xi$ for every $n > n_{\xi,\theta}$. Then for $n > \max\{n_\mu, n_{\xi,\theta}\}$ the inequality (11) becomes

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\theta \setminus K^\xi)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}(K^{\mu+\epsilon} \setminus K)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon + \eta.$$

Since $\bigcup_{\mu>0}\bigcup_{\mu<\xi<\theta<\delta} K^\theta \setminus K^\xi = K^\delta \setminus K$ and $\bigcap_{\mu>0} K_n^{\mu+\epsilon} \setminus K \subseteq \overline{K^\epsilon} \setminus K$ the continuity of the measure on monotone (in the sense of set inclusion) sequences of sets gives

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\delta \setminus K)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}(\overline{K^\epsilon} \setminus K)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon + \eta.$$

By the arbitrariness of η, and the fact that the Lebesgue measure of the boundary of K^ϵ is zero, we obtain (9). This gives (8) and then follow the existence of the limit (4). □

The lower semicontinuity of the outer Minkowski content with respect to the Hausdorff convergence is an immediate consequence of the characterization provided in Lemma 2.2.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\{K_n\}$ be a sequence of continua in $\overline{\Omega}$ converging to a continuum K in the Hausdorff distance. Then*

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{SM}^1(K_n).$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. By definition of the Hausdorff distance, for every $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$ there exists n_δ such that $K_n \subset K^\delta$ and $K \subset K_n^\delta$ for every $n > n_\delta$. This with (8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\epsilon \setminus K^\delta)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon &\leq \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}(K_n^{\epsilon+\delta} \setminus K_n)}{\epsilon+\delta} - \pi(\epsilon+\delta)\right)\frac{\epsilon+\delta}{\epsilon} + \frac{\pi\delta(2\epsilon+\delta)}{\epsilon} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon+\delta}{\epsilon}\mathcal{SM}^1(K_n) + \frac{\pi\delta(2\epsilon+\delta)}{\epsilon},\end{aligned}$$

and taking the limit as $n \to \infty$ gives

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\epsilon \setminus K^\delta)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon \leq \frac{\epsilon+\delta}{\epsilon}\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{SM}^1(K_n) + \frac{\pi\delta(2\epsilon+\delta)}{\epsilon}$$

Letting $\delta \to 0$, since $\bigcup_{\delta>0}(K^\epsilon \setminus K^\delta) = K^\epsilon \setminus K$, the continuity of the measure on increasing sequences of sets yields

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(K^\epsilon \setminus K)}{\epsilon} - \pi\epsilon \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{SM}^1(K_n)$$

and by the arbitrariness of ϵ the theorem is proved. □

As application of Theorem 2.1 we answer to a question posed by Cerf in [7]. In that paper the notion of *Hausdorff lower semicontinuous envelope of the perimeter*

$$S(K) := \inf\left\{\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K_n) : K_n \text{ Lipschitz continuum, } K_n \to^H K\right\} \tag{12}$$

has been studied and identified in the following quantity

$$\mathcal{S}(K) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}} \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}} \sum_{O\in\mathcal{C}(K,U)} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial O \setminus \partial U),$$

where K is a continuum, $\mathcal{C}(K,U)$ is the collection of all residual domains of K in U (namely connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus K$) and the supremum is taken over all families $\mathcal{U}$ of pairwise disjoint domains of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Cerf asked to compare $\mathcal{S}$ with more classical quantities, like for instance the Minkowski content. Here is our answer.

Corollary 2.1. *For every continuum set $K \subset \overline{\Omega}$ the following equality holds:*

$$\mathcal{S}(K) = \mathcal{SM}^1(K).$$

Proof. Let K_n be a sequence of Lipschitz continua in $\overline{\Omega}$ converging to K in the Hausdorff distance. By Theorem 2.1 and (5) it follows that

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{SM}^1(K_n) = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K_n).$$

and, by taking the infimum among all those Lipschitz continua K_n in $\overline{\Omega}$ converging to K in the Hausdorff distance, recalling the definition (12), we obtain the inequality $\mathcal{SM}^1(K) \le \mathcal{S}(K)$.

For the reverse inequality we may assume $\mathcal{SM}^1(K)$ to be finite, otherwise the inequality is trivial. Then by co-area formula and Fatou's lemma (see [10]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{SM}^1(K) &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_0^\epsilon \mathcal{H}^1(\{d_K = t\})\, dt \ge \int_0^1 \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathcal{H}^1(\{d_K = t\epsilon\})\, dt \\ &= \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathcal{H}^1(\{d_K = \epsilon\}) \ge \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\{d_K \le \epsilon\}), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of the inclusion $\partial\{d_K \le \epsilon\} \subseteq \{d_K = \epsilon\}$. The set $\{d_K \le \epsilon\}$ is a continuum (it is connected because of the connectedness of K) converging to K in the Hausdorff distance. Moreover, it has a countable number of residual domains in $\mathbb{R}^2$ (see [7]) and so $\partial\{d_K \le \epsilon\}$ has a countable number of connected components that are $\mathcal{H}^1$-rectifiable. Then, a consequence of the proof of [2, Theorem 4.4.8] allows to approximate each connected component of $\partial\{d_K \le \epsilon\}$ with the union of a finite number of segments with smaller one dimensional Hausdorff measure. This implies that we can approximate, in the Hausdorff convergence, the set $\{d_K \le \epsilon\}$ with a sequence of Lipschitz continua $\{K_n\}$ of smaller one dimensional Hausdorff measure of the boundary. Now, by Blaschke selection theorem (see [2, Theorem 4.4.15]), the Hausdorff distance over closed sets is metrizable. Therefore, by a standard diagonal argument, we can approximate the continuum K with a sequence of Lipschitz continua $\{K_n\}$ of smaller one dimensional Hausdorff measure of the boundary, and this combined with (13) and (12) yields

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K) \ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K_n) \ge \mathcal{S}(K).$$

The corollary is then proved. □

We finally point out that this corollary may serve as a translator of similar results independently established for the Hausdorff lower semicontinuous envelope of the perimeter $\mathcal{S}$ in [7] and for the outer Minkowski content $\mathcal{SM}^1$ in [28].

3. Optimal obstacles: toward existence, regularity and geometry.

In this section we analyze problem (7) in a general setting. We start proving the existence of a solution to this problem; then we study some of its qualitative properties, from regularity to geometrical aspects.

Theorem 3.1 (Existence)**.** *There exists a maximizer K_{opt} of problem* (7)*.*

Proof. The proof follows the Direct Methods of the Calculus of Variations. Let $\{K_n\}$ be a maximizing sequence of problem (7), so that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_n) \to \sup\{\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K) : K \subseteq \overline{\Omega},\, K \text{ continuum}, \mathcal{SM}^1(K) \leq L\}, \qquad (14)$$

as $n \to \infty$. From Blaschke selection theorem there exists a compact $K_{\rm opt} \subset \overline{\Omega}$ and a subsequence, that we still denote by $\{K_n\}$, such that K_n converges to $K_{\rm opt}$ in the Hausdorff distance. Since the Hausdorff distance preserves connectedness (see [15, Proposition 2.2.17]) the set $K_{\rm opt}$ is in fact a continuum inside $\overline{\Omega}$. Moreover, thanks to Theorem 2.1 it follows that $\mathcal{SM}^1(K_{\rm opt}) \leq L$. Then $K_{\rm opt}$ turns out to be an admissible competitor in (7). Now, from the Sverak continuity result (see [25]) $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_n) \to \lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt})$ as $n \to \infty$, and this with (14) implies that $K_{\rm opt}$ solves problem (7). □

Before giving the first properties of the maximizer $K_{\rm opt}$, let us introduce the notion of *local convexity*.

Definition 3.1. *A set K is said to be* locally convex *in Ω if, for any $x \in K \cap \Omega$, there exists a radius $r > 0$ such that $K \cap B(x, r)$ is convex (and contained in Ω).*

Theorem 3.2 (Qualitative properties of a maximizer)**.** *Every maximizer K_{opt} of problem* (7) *has the following properties.*

- **(i):** *K_{opt} is locally convex in Ω. Moreover, if Ω is convex then K_{opt} is convex.*
- **(ii):** *The perimeter constraint is saturated, namely $\mathcal{SM}^1(K_{opt}) = L$.*
- **(iii):** *If there exist $x \in K_{opt} \cap \Omega$ and a radius $r > 0$ such that $K_{opt} \cap B(x, r)$ is a segment, then K_{opt} is necessarily a segment and Ω is symmetric with respect to the line passing through this segment.*
- **(iv):** *K_{opt} is either a segment or Lipschitz regular inside Ω.*
- **(v):** *If Ω has k holes with $k \geq 0$ (i.e., $\partial\Omega$ has k connected components), then K_{opt} has at most k holes.*

Proof. Let us proceed by contradiction. For (i) we assume that $K_{\rm opt}$ is not locally convex. By Definition 3.1 and the connectedness of $K_{\rm opt}$, this means that there exists a point $x \in K_{\rm opt} \cap \Omega$ and a radius $r > 0$ so small so that $K_{\rm opt} \cap B(x, r)$ is a connected set in Ω but not convex. Let us introduce the convex hull H of $K_{\rm opt} \cap B(x, r)$ (which is contained into $B(x, r)$ by convexity) and define the continuum $\widehat{K} := K_{\rm opt} \cup H$. Since $K_{\rm opt}$ is strictly included in $\widehat{K}$ (in the sense that the difference contains a set of positive capacity) we have $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus \widehat{K}) > \lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt})$. Therefore, to reach a contradiction, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{SM}^1(\widehat{K}) \leq L$. For a regular domain, it is clear since in the plane, the convex hull diminishes the perimeter. For a general continuum, we proceed by approximation using the characterization of $\mathcal{SM}^1$ provided in Corollary 2.1 and the result follows in the same way. Indeed, for every $\epsilon > 0$ we may consider the sequence of Lipschitz regular continua $\{K_n\}$ converging to K in the Hausdorff distance so that $\liminf_n \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K_n) \leq \mathcal{SM}^1(K) + \epsilon$. Since the convex hull and the union of sets are stable with respect to the Hausdorff

distance, it turns out that the set $\widehat{K}_n := K_n \cup H_n$ with H_n the convex hull of $K_n \cap B(x,r)$ converges to $\widehat{K}$ in the Hausdorff distance (notice that H_n converges to H, see [15, Exercise 2.5]). Therefore, by Corollary 2.1 and formula (12)

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(\widehat{K}) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \widehat{K}_n) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K_n) \leq \mathcal{SM}^1(K) + \epsilon,$$

that gives the thesis by the arbitrariness of ϵ. The second statement in the case Ω is convex follows from what has just been proved for local convexity and the fact that the convex hull of a set included in the convex domain $\overline{\Omega}$ is still included in $\overline{\Omega}$.

For (ii) let us now assume $\mathcal{SM}^1(K_{\rm opt}) < L$. Then attaching to $K_{\rm opt}$ a small segment (see [26, 27] for a similar argument), from the strict monotonicity of the first eigenvalue and the subadditivity of the outer Minkowski content with respect to set inclusion (see [1]), we may increase $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt})$ with an admissible set contradicting the optimality of $K_{\rm opt}$. Therefore, maximizer of (7) saturates the perimeter constraint.

To prove (iii), without loss of generality, we can assume $K_{\rm opt} \cap B(x,r)$ to be the diameter of $B(x,r)$, subset of the x_1-axis. Let us denote by Σ this segment. We are going to make perturbations of Σ to write some kind of optimality condition on the segment. Let us consider this segment as two segments (the upper Σ^+ and the lower Σ^-) stuck together and choose two vertical deformation fields $V^+ \geq 0$ and $V^- \geq 0$ acting respectively on Σ^+ and Σ^-. The deformed set K_t is defined for $t > 0$ small as

$$K_t := \{(x_1, x_2) \in \overline{\Omega} : \, x_1 \in \Sigma, -tV^-(x_1) \leq x_2 \leq tV^+(x_1)\}.$$

At first order the perimeter of K_t (recall (6)) has not changed:

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K_t) = \mathcal{SM}^1(\Sigma) + O(t^2).$$

Moreover, the shape derivative of the first eigenvalue in that situation exists, see [22] for the Dirichlet energy, but the formula is the same for the first eigenvalue as explained in [15, chapter 5], and it is given by

$$d\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K, V) = \int_\Sigma |\nabla u_1^+(x_1,0)|^2 V^+(x_1) dx - \int_\Sigma |\nabla u_1^-(x_1,0)|^2 V^-(x_1) dx \quad (15)$$

where $|\nabla u_1^+(x_1,0)| = \partial u_1^+/\partial x_2$ and $|\nabla u_1^-(x_1,0)| = -\partial u_1^-/\partial x_2$) denote, respectively, the vertical derivatives of the trace from above and below Σ. Since the perimeter did not changed at order 1, it follows that the shape derivative of the eigenvalue must be non-positive. But this must hold true for any choice of V^+, V^- and (15) implies

$$\frac{\partial u_1^+}{\partial x_2} = |\nabla u_1^+(x,0)| = |\nabla u_1^-(x,0)| = -\frac{\partial u_1^-}{\partial x_2} \quad \text{for } x \in \Sigma. \quad (16)$$

Now, since u_1 can always be extended to be an $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ Sobolev function, consider the function $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ defined as $v(x_1,x_2) := u_1(x_1,x_2) - u_1(x_1,-x_2)$ for all $(x_1,x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. By definition $-\Delta v = \lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt})v$ inside $B(x,r) \setminus K_{\rm opt}$ and by (16) $v = \nabla v = 0$ along Σ. Using Holmgren uniqueness theorem, v must vanish in a neighborhood of $K_{\rm opt} \cap B(x,r)$, so in the whole plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ by analyticity. Therefore, $u_1(x_1,x_2) = u(x_1,-x_2)$ for all $(x_1,x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and u_1 above and below the line passing through the segment $K_{\rm opt} \cap B(x,r)$ must share the locus of zeros, otherwise it would contradict the positiveness of the first eigenfunction. Moreover, it implies that Ω has to be symmetric with respect to that line.

For (iv) we rely on points (i) and (iii) just proved. By local convexity we see that if $K_{\rm opt}$ is not Lipschitz regular inside Ω then necessarily point (iii) occurs and $K_{\rm opt}$ is a segment.

At last for (v) let us assume that the boundary of $K_{\rm opt}$ has more than $k+1$ connected components. Now that we know from point (iv) that $K_{\rm opt}$ is Lipschitz inside Ω, every connected component of $\partial K_{\rm opt}$ is a Jordan curve. Therefore, if there are more than $k+1$ such curves, at least one of them must enclose a hole in $K_{\rm opt}$ which is contained into Ω (for topological reasons and the fact that $K_{\rm opt}$ is connected). Removing this hole will decrease the outer Minkowski content and increase the eigenvalue which is impossible. □

Remark 3.1. *We will see in the situation of the ring, where Ω has exactly one hole (see Theorem 4.3 below), that the two possibilities K_{opt} has 1 or 2 holes actually happen, depending on the perimeter constraint.*

Let us now introduce the following terminology.

Definition 3.2. *We decompose the boundary ∂K_{opt} into two disjoint parts Γ_{free} and Γ_{touch} so that the* free boundary $\Gamma_{free} \subset \Omega$ *while the* touching boundary $\Gamma_{touch} \subset \partial\Omega$.

We turn on the regularity of the free boundary.

Theorem 3.3 (Regularity of the free boundary)**.** *The free boundary Γ_{free} of K_{opt} is of class C^∞. Moreover, the following optimality condition holds:*

$$|\nabla u_1(x)|^2 = \mu \mathcal{C}(x), \qquad x \in \Gamma_{free}, \tag{17}$$

where u_1 is the first eigenfuction corresponding to $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{opt})$ and $\mathcal{C}(x)$ is the curvature of Γ_{free} at the point x.

If $\Gamma_{\rm free}$ is a segment as in (iii) of the previous theorem, the relation (17) has to be understood in the sense of the jump of the gradient.

Proof. The regularity of the boundary is quite classical, see e.g. [8], or also the proof of Theorem 2.2 of [5]. This follows writing any free part of the boundary as the graph γ of a concave function and using a Schauder's regularity result with a bootstrap argument. In our problem (by contrast with what happens e.g. in [5]) the domain is not convex, but is the complement of a locally convex set into Ω. Therefore, classical regularity results in the plane imply that $|\nabla u|^2 \in L^p(\gamma)$ for some $p > 1$ (see [18]). This is enough to start the bootstrap argument and we can follow the same line as in [5] to get the regularity result.

Therefore, since any maximizer (different from a segment) has free parts of the boundary which are C^∞ we can write rigorously the optimality conditions. Let us begin with the case where $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt})$ is a simple eigenvalue. Under variations of the free part $\Gamma_{\rm free}$ of the boundary (assume $\Gamma_{\rm free}$ is modified by a regular vector field $x \mapsto I + tV(x)$), the shape derivative of the normalized first eigenvalue is given by

$$d\lambda_1(\Gamma_{\rm free}; V) = -\int_{\Gamma_{\rm free}} |\nabla u_1|^2 \, V.n \, d\sigma.$$

where n is the exterior normal to $\Gamma_{\rm free}$ (which exists a.e.). Moreover, since by the assumption on V the vector field $I + tV$ preserves the regularity of $\Gamma_{\rm free}$, using (5)

we can recall the shape derivative of the classical perimeter given by [15, Corollary 5.4.16] to obtain

$$d\mathcal{SM}^1(\Gamma_{\text{free}}; V) = \int_{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} \mathcal{C}\, V.n d\,\sigma.$$

Therefore the proportionality of these two shape derivatives through some Lagrange multiplier yields the existence of a constant $\mu > 0$ such that (17) holds and the theorem is proved for a simple eigenvalue.

Now let us consider the case where $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\text{opt}})$ is a multiple eigenvalue. This can occur since $\Omega \setminus K_{\text{opt}}$ may have several connected components. Let us denote by ω such a connected component and assume we make variations of its free boundary Γ_{free} only by preserving its perimeter. We denote by ω_t the perturbed domain. Since we have the expansion

$$\lambda_1(\omega_t) = \lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\text{opt}}) - t \int_{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} |\nabla u_1|^2\, V.n\, d\sigma + o(t)$$

we see that $\int_{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} |\nabla u_1|^2\, V.n\, d\sigma \geq 0$ for any deformation field V preserving the perimeter of Γ_{free}. In other words

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} \mathcal{C}\, V.n d\,\sigma = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \int_{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} |\nabla u_1|^2\, V.n\, d\sigma \geq 0\,. \tag{18}$$

Changing V in $-V$ in (18) implies that

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} \mathcal{C}\, V.n d\,\sigma = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \int_{\Gamma_{\text{free}}} |\nabla u_1|^2\, V.n\, d\sigma = 0\,. \tag{19}$$

Now, (19) classically implies that there exists a Lagrange multiplier μ such that (17) holds and the theorem is proved in any case. □

Remark 3.2. *There is a case which deserve more explanation, it is when K_{opt} is a Lipschitz regular and the free part we are dealing with is a segment Σ. We will see below that it is impossible, but it will follow from* (17) *and Hopf's lemma, see Corollary 3.1. In that case, it may be not clear that we can perform a (global) perturbation preserving the perimeter. Actually, we can always do it. If there is some other part γ on Γ_{free} which is strictly convex we can perform a perturbation of both Σ and γ which preserves the perimeter and finally get, using* (17) *on γ, $\int_\Sigma |\nabla u_1|^2 V.n = 0$ for any V which gives $|\nabla u_1|^2 = 0$ on Σ which is precisely* (17)*. At last, if there are no strictly convex part on the free boundary, we can always compensate a deformation field on Σ by another deformation elsewhere to preserve the perimeter globally either by pushing another segment which is on the boundary inward or by digging a small hole near the boundary of Ω and, in any case, we come to the conclusion that $\int_\Sigma |\nabla u_1|^2 V.n = 0$.*

Remark 3.3. *The explicit value of the Lagrange multiplier μ in* (17) *can be obtained using Gauss and Rellich formulas:*

$$\mu = \frac{\int_{\partial K_{opt}} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}\right)^2 X.n\, d\sigma}{\mathcal{SM}^1(K_{opt})}$$

where $X := (x_1, x_2)$ (see [5] *for a similar result).*

The optimality condition (17) expresses, in a quantitative way, the fact that a maximizer of (7) has to be locally convex (see point (i) in Theorem 3.2). As

application, we can exclude particular geometries for the free boundary: segments and arcs of circles.

Corollary 3.1 (Geometry of the free boundary)**.** *Let K_{opt} be a maximizer of* (7) *that is not a segment. If $\Omega \setminus K$ is connected, then its free boundary Γ_{free} does not contain any segment. If otherwise it has several connected components which realize the first eigenvalue, then any free boundary of them does not contain any segment; but any connected components of the free boundary not realizing the first eigenvalue is a segment.*

Moreover, if the outer boundary of Ω is not a circle then arcs of circles are never contained in the free boundary Γ_{free} of a maximizer.

Proof. The assertions follow from the optimality condition (17) and Hopf's Lemma. For the proof of the second assertion we refer to [5] (see also [14]) where similar statements have been proved for the second eigenvalue of the Laplacian. □

Remark 3.4. *We will study in the next section the case where the outer boundary of Ω is a circle. This includes the case where Ω is a disk, an annulus or more generally a disk with several holes. In these situations, we will identify the maximizer for certain values of L (actually for all values of L when Ω is itself a disk).*

The intuition may lead to think that a maximizer of (7) must stay inside Ω, see for example the situation described in [12] where the maximizing position is always at the center of the domain while only in the minimizing positions the obstacle touches the boundary. This is probably true when Ω is convex, but we were not able to prove it. On the other hand, when Ω is not convex, we will now prove that it is never the case when L is large enough and that $K_{\rm opt}$ must *touch the boundary of* Ω in these cases. To show this we rely on an object that measure the largest perimeter one can reach by means of a convex subset of Ω.

Proposition 3.1. *The following quantity*

$$L^*(\Omega) := \max\{\mathcal{SM}^1(K) :\ K \subseteq \overline{\Omega},\ K \text{ closed and convex}\} \tag{20}$$

is well defined and

$$L^*(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{SM}^1(\overline{\Omega}),$$

where the equality holds if and only if Ω is convex.

Proof. From Blaschke selection theorem, we infer the existence of a compact set $K^* \subset \overline{\Omega}$ and a subsequence, that we still denote by $\{K_n\}$, such that K_n converges to K^* in the Hausdorff distance. Moreover, the Hausdorff distance preserves convexity (recall [15, Exercise 2.5] with the uniqueness of the limit) so that K^* is also convex in $\overline{\Omega}$. Therefore, using (5) with the continuity of the perimeter on convex sets with respect to the Hausdorff convergence we obtain the existence of a solution for the maximization problem (20) and

$$L^*(\Omega) = \mathcal{SM}^1(K^*).$$

Now, K^* is a convex set included in the convex hull $\widehat{\Omega}$ of $\overline{\Omega}$, therefore recalling again (5), the facts that the Hausdorff measure increases with respect to the inclusion of convex sets and decreases by taking the convex hull we have

$$\mathcal{SM}^1(K^*) \leq \mathcal{SM}^1(\widehat{\Omega}) \leq \mathcal{SM}^1(\overline{\Omega}),$$

and the second equality holds whenever Ω is convex. □

Theorem 3.4 (Touch of the boundary)**.** *If* $L \in \left(L^*(\Omega), \mathcal{SM}^1(\overline{\Omega})\right)$ *with* $L^*(\Omega)$ *defined by* (20)*, then every maximizer* K_{opt} *of* (7) *has non empty touching boundary* Γ_{touch}*, namely* $K_{opt} \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$*.*

Proof. The crucial assumption $L > L^*(\Omega)$ implies that there exists a segment joining two points $x, y \in K_{\rm opt}$ not included in $\overline{\Omega}$. Let us assume, for a contradiction, that $K_{\rm opt}$ does not touch the boundary of Ω. Assume now that x and y are on the same horizontal line (by rotating the frame) and choose among the different arcs joining x to y on $\partial K_{\rm opt}$ an arc which let $K_{\rm opt}$ above it (in other words an arc positively oriented with the usual convention in the plane). Let us now choose on this arc the highest point z (if there is more than one, choose the first one on the arc). By local convexity of $K_{\rm opt}$, we have $L = K_{\rm opt} \cap B(z, r)$ convex for some $r > 0$. If we consider a supporting line for the convex set L passing by z, by construction $K_{\rm opt}$ must be above this supporting line. This contradicts the fact that z is a (local) maximum on the boundary of $K_{\rm opt}$. □

4. Optimal obstacles in specific domains

We concentrate on problem (7) for specific shapes of Ω: a disk, a ring, and a perforated disk with convex holes. Precisely, we prove symmetry and, in some cases non symmetry results, identifying the explicit solution.

4.1. **Explicit solution in circular domains.**

We identify the unique maximizer of (7) in the case the domain Ω is a disk. The proof of this theorem relies on some results obtained in the sixties by Hersch, Payne, and Weinberger (see [16, 17, 23] and also [13, Section 3.5] for a concise explanation of these papers).

Theorem 4.1 (Hersch-Payne-Weinberger)**.** *Let* D *be a doubly connected domain of the plane (i.e., a domain bounded between two disjoint and rectifiable Jordan curves) with outer boundary* Γ_0 *and inner boundary* Γ_1 *of length respectively* L_0 *and* L_1*. If*

$$L_0^2 - L_1^2 = 4\pi\mathcal{L}(D), \tag{21}$$

then the the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(D)$ *is uniquely maximized whenever* D *is the ring with outer boundary of length* L_0 *and inner boundary of length* L_1*.*

In this theorem the competitors have free both the inner and outer boundaries; but perimeter and area are strongly constrained. In our problem (7) the exterior boundary is fixed and only the interior boundary is free to move but there are no constraint on the area of K. We develop a purely geometrical argument in order to fit into the hypothesis of the Hersch, Payne, and Weinberger result: as a consequence we provide an explicit solution to (7) in the case that Ω is a disk.

Theorem 4.2. *Let* Ω *be an open disk* $B(r_0)$ *of radius* r_0*, and let* $L \in (0, 2\pi r_0)$*. Then problem* (7) *has a unique solution: the maximizer* K_{opt} *is given by the closed disk* $\overline{B(r)}$ *concentric to* $B(r_0)$ *of radius* r *so that* $2\pi r = L$ *(i.e., with perimeter equal to the constraint* L*).*

Proof. We search for a solution to (7) only among *convex* competitors with Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial K) = L$, since non-convex sets and sets with perimeter less than L are ruled out by points (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.2 (recall also (5)). Therefore, to prove the theorem it is sufficient to show that for every closed convex set K

contained in $\overline{B(r_0)}$ with $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial K) = L$, different from the disk $\overline{B(r)}$ concentric to $B(r_0)$ and with perimeter L, it holds

$$\lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus K) < \lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus \overline{B(r)}). \tag{22}$$

We prove this inequality exploring four cases, according to the shape and the location of the convex set K.

Case 1: K is a disk not concentric to $B(r_0)$. Since $B(r_0)$ and K are disks, the condition $(2\pi r_0)^2 - L^2 = 4\pi\mathcal{L}(B(r_0) \setminus K)$ is clearly satisfied. If K is included in $B(r_0)$ we can apply Theorem 4.1 to the doubly connected domain $D = B(r_0) \setminus K$ with $L_0 = 2\pi r_0$, $L_1 = L$ and obtain the inequality (22). Otherwise we can use the stronger result contained in [12] that yields (22) whenever K is a disk not necessarily included in $B(r_0)$.

Case 2: K is neither a disk nor a segment and is contained in $B(r_0)$. Clearly for the disk $B(r_0)$ the condition $(2\pi r_0)^2 = 4\pi\mathcal{L}(B(r_0))$ holds. Moreover, the *isoperimetric inequality* for the set K (recalling (5)) implies that

$$L^2 = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K)^2 > 4\pi\mathcal{L}(K),$$

which combined with the previous equality for $B(r_0)$ yields

$$(2\pi r_0)^2 - L^2 < 4\pi\mathcal{L}(B(r_0) \setminus K). \tag{23}$$

This means that in this case we can not apply Theorem 4.1 to the doubly connected domain $D = B(r_0) \setminus K$ with $L_0 = 2\pi r_0$ and $L_1 = L$, since the equality condition (21) is not satisfied. However it is possible to modify the set $B(r_0) \setminus K$, increasing its outer perimeter L_0 and decreasing its area $\mathcal{L}(B(r_0) \setminus K)$ until the equality in (23) is reached. More precisely, starting from the disk $B(r_0)$, we construct a new domain $\widehat{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

i) the perimeter increases: $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial B(r_0)) < \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{B})$;
ii) the set is smaller: $B(r_0) \supset \widehat{B}$;
iii) the equality condition holds: $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{B})^2 - L^2 = 4\pi\mathcal{L}(\widehat{B} \setminus K)$.

An explicit construction of the set $\widehat{B}$ can be obtained, e.g., by perturbing the whole boundary of the disk $B(r_0)$ with an inward pointing vector field that continuously increases the perimeter and decreases the set (in the sense of set inclusion). Moreover, it is not difficult to see that the perimeter in point i) can be made arbitrarily large until point iii) is satisfied (and of course point ii) contributes in this direction).

Therefore, from point ii) and the strict monotonicity of the first eigenvalue with respect to set inclusion, we obtain the estimate

$$\lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus K) < \lambda_1(\widehat{B} \setminus K). \tag{24}$$

From point iii) we can now apply Theorem 4.1 to the set $D = \widehat{B} \setminus K$ with $L_0 = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{B})$ and $L_1 = L$ so that

$$\lambda_1(\widehat{B} \setminus K) < \lambda_1(B(\widehat{r}_0) \setminus \overline{B(r)}), \tag{25}$$

where $B(\widehat{r}_0)$ is the open disk concentric to $B(r_0)$ (and in particular to $\overline{B(r)}$) of radius $\widehat{r}_0$ so that $2\pi\widehat{r}_0 = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{B})$. This with point i) implies that $\widehat{r}_0 > r_0$, thus the trivial strict inclusion $B(r_0) \subset B(\widehat{r}_0)$ holds. Recalling again the strict monotonicity of the first eigenvalue yields

$$\lambda_1(B(\widehat{r}_0) \setminus \overline{B(r)}) < \lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus \overline{B(r)}), \tag{26}$$

which combined with (24) and (25) implies (22).

Case 3: K is neither a disk nor a segment and is not contained in $B(r_0)$. We proceed by an approximation argument. Fix a (small) real number $\epsilon > 0$, and consider the set $K_\epsilon := \tau_\epsilon(K)$ obtained contracting K of ϵ by in the inward pointing vector field to the center of the disk $B(r_0)$. By definition, K_ϵ belongs to the previous *Case 2* and then, combining (24) with (25), we obtain the following estimate for K_ϵ

$$\lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus K_\epsilon) < \lambda_1(B(\widehat{r}_0) \setminus \overline{B(r)})$$

where $B(\widehat{r}_0)$ is the same open disk defined above. The convergence, as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, of K_ϵ to K in the Hausdorff distance with the Sverak continuity result [25] yields

$$\lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus K) \leq \lambda_1(B(\widehat{r}_0) \setminus \overline{B(r)}),$$

which combined with (26) implies the strict inequality (22).

Case 4: K is a segment. As in *Case 3* we proceed by an approximation argument. For a (small) real number $\epsilon > 0$, consider the rectangle K_ϵ with a longest side onto K of length $(1-\epsilon)L/2$ and smallest sides of length $\epsilon L/2$ to be contained in $B(r_0)$. By definition, K_ϵ belongs to *Case 2* and, as $\epsilon \to 0$, K_ϵ converges to K in the Hausdorff distance. Therefore, arguing as in *Case 3*, we arrive to the inequality (22) also when K is a segment. □

Remark 4.1. *In the proof of the theorem, the use of a result from* [12] *is limited to the study of* Case 1*: without using this result we prove the inequality*

$$\lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus K) \leq \lambda_1(B(r_0) \setminus \overline{B(r)}), \quad \text{for every continuum } K \text{ with } \mathcal{SM}^1(K) \leq L,$$

but nothing on what it concerns uniqueness.

4.2. **About symmetry of solutions in annular domains.** We discuss the symmetry of a solution to (7) in the case the domain Ω is a ring. Due to topological reasons, every maximizer of (7) can not be radially symmetric, whenever L is less than or equal to twice the perimeter of the inner disk. Surprisingly this *symmetry breaking* appears for other values of the perimeter constraints L, namely for those close to the perimeter of the inner disk. However, for large values of the constraint, namely for those close to the perimeter of the ring, the solution is provided by a set with *full* symmetry. Anyhow, for all values of the constraint, the solution has some *mild* symmetry, namely an axial symmetry.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\Omega = B(r_0) \setminus \overline{B(r_1)}$ be a ring, where $B(r_0)$ and $B(r_1)$ are, respectively, concentric open disks of radii $0 < r_1 < r_0$. According to the value of the parameter $L \in (0, 2\pi(r_0 + r_1))$ the following properties hold.*

- **(i):** *(Radial symmetry) There exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that if $L > 2\pi(r_0 + r_1) - \alpha_0$ then problem (7) has a unique solution: the maximizer K_{opt} is given by the ring $\overline{B(r)} \setminus B(r_1)$ concentric to Ω of radius $r = L/(2\pi) - r_1$.*
- **(ii):** *(Axial Symmetry) For every L with $0 < L < 2\pi(r_0 + r_1)$ every maximizer K_{opt} of problem (7) is symmetric with respect to a line passing through the center of $B(r_0)$.*
- **(iii):** *(Symmetry breaking) There exists $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that if $L < 4\pi r_1 + \alpha_1$ then every maximizer K_{opt} of problem (7) is not radially symmetric.*

Proof. (i) We start introducing a suitable partition of the domain Ω. Slice Ω in the n disjoint rings contained in Ω of size $1/n$ and then divide each one of them with n disjoint cones with vertexes in the center of $B(r_0)$ and opening angles $2\pi/n$. This slicing provides a partition $\{\Omega_i(n)\}$ of Ω in n^2 *patches*, namely truncated cones of size $1/n$ and opening angle $2\pi/n$. The patches inside the rings $B(r_0)\setminus\overline{B(r_0-1/n)}$ and $B(r_1+1/n)\setminus\overline{B(r_1)}$ are, respectively, called *exterior* and *interior* patches. Moreover, we say that two neighbor patches are *connected* in the case that ∂K_n crosses the interface between them, otherwise we refer to *disconnected patches*.

Now, consider a sequence of maximizers $\{K_n\}$ of problem (7) associated to the length constraints $\{L_n\}$, where

$$L_n \uparrow 2\pi(r_0+r_1), \quad \text{as } n\to\infty.$$

Then $\lambda_1(\Omega\setminus K_n)\uparrow\infty$ as $n\to\infty$, and so we can label the sequence of $\{K_n\}$ in order to satisfy $\lambda_1(\Omega\setminus K_n) > \max_i \lambda_1(\Omega_i(n))$ for every n large enough. This, in particular, implies that

$$\Omega\setminus K_n \text{ can not contain any patch } \Omega_i(n) \text{ for } i=1,\dots,n. \tag{27}$$

We then claim that the boundary of K_n must enclose the internal disk $B(r_1)$, namely that the number k of disconnected interior patches is zero, for every n large enough. To prove this we estimate the perimeter of ∂K_n. We start noticing that, by (27) with the local convexity of K_n (see Theorem 3.2 (i)), the number of disconnected interior patches corresponds to the one of disconnected exterior patches. This means that every couple of disjoint interior patches is linked to a couple of exterior ones by means of two Jordan curves, which are different parts of the boundary ∂K_n and so their corresponding length is greater than (r_0-r_1-2/n). Moreover, the part of the boundary ∂K_n that is inside the connected exterior patches is larger (again by local convexity) than $2\pi(1-2k/n)(r_0-1/n)$ and, similarly, the part of the boundary ∂K_n that is inside the connected interior patches has a length greater than $2\pi(1-2k/n)r_1$. At last, the perimeter constraint yields

$$2\pi(1-2k/n)(r_0-1/n)+2\pi(1-2k/n)r_1+2k(r_0-r_1-2/n)\le 2\pi(r_0+r_1)$$

which may be turned into the following bound on k

$$k\le \frac{\pi n}{(r_0-r_1)n^2-2(\pi r_0+\pi r_1+1)n+2\pi}.$$

Therefore, for every n large enough, we can let the right hand side of this inequality smaller than 1 and so $k=0$. This, in particular, proves what claimed before: the boundary of K_n encloses the internal disk $B(r_1)$. Of course the region between K_n and $B(r_1)$ can be filled by decreasing the perimeter and increasing the first eigenvalue. This means that, for every n large enough, we may look for the solution of problem (7) only among sets K_n enclosing the internal disk $B(r_1)$, satisfying $\mathcal{SM}^1(K_n)=\mathcal{SM}^1(K_n\cup B(r_1))+\mathcal{SM}^1(B(r_1))$. This allows to work with $K_n\cup B(r_1)$ as a varying domain, to apply Theorem 4.2 to this new family of sets and to obtain the thesis on the radial symmetry.

(ii) Consider a line l passing through the center of Ω dividing $\Omega\setminus K$ into two pieces $\Omega^+\setminus K^+$ and $\Omega^-\setminus K^-$ of equal perimeter (in the sense of one dimensional Hausdorff measure of the boundaries) labeled so that

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega^-\setminus K^-}|\nabla u|^2dx}{\int_{\Omega^-\setminus K^-}u^2dx}\le\frac{\int_{\Omega^+\setminus K^+}|\nabla u|^2dx}{\int_{\Omega^+\setminus K^+}u^2dx}, \tag{28}$$

for an arbitrarily function $u \in H^1(\Omega \setminus K)$. Combining the algebraic inequality

$$\frac{a+b}{c+d} \leq \max\left\{\frac{a}{c}, \frac{b}{d}\right\}, \quad a, b, c, d \geq 0,$$

with (28), yields

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt}) &\leq \frac{\int_{\Omega^+\setminus K^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega^-\setminus K^-} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega^+\setminus K^+} u^2 dx + \int_{\Omega^-\setminus K^-} u^2 dx} \\ &\leq \frac{\int_{\Omega^+\setminus K^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega^+\setminus K^+} u^2 dx} = \frac{\int_{\Omega\setminus K_s^+} |\nabla u_s|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega\setminus K_s^+} u_s^2 dx},\end{aligned}$$

where K_s^+ denotes the union of K^+ with its reflection through l while u_s is the $H^1(\Omega \setminus K_s^+)$ Sobolev function that coincides with u on $\Omega \setminus K^+$ and is symmetric w.r.t. l (notice that reflecting Ω^+ gives Ω^-). By the arbitrariness of u, and thus of u_s, and the fact that the first eigenfunction of $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_s^+)$ is symmetric w.r.t. l, we may choose u_s to be the first eigenfunction of $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_s^+)$. This implies that $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt}) \leq \lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_s^+)$. Moreover, by optimality of $K_{\rm opt}$ the reverse inequality $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_{\rm opt}) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_s^+)$ holds, and then all the inequalities above are in fact equalities. Therefore, by analyticity of the eigenfunctions, we obtain $K_{\rm opt} = K_s^+$.

(iii) Obviously, the symmetry breaking holds true whenever $L < 4\pi r_1$. Then, we assume $L \geq 4\pi r_1$ and write $L = 4\pi r_1 + 2\pi h$ for some $0 \leq h \leq r_0 - r_1$. Fix a set K of perimeter L which is included in $\overline{\Omega}$ (K could be a disk if L is not too large). Then, define $\delta > 0$ as $\delta := \lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K) - \lambda_1(\Omega)$. Moreover, among all those radially symmetric sets $\overline{B(s)} \setminus B(r)$ with $r_1 \leq r \leq s \leq r_0$ and of perimeter less than L (this occurs for a right choice of the couple of radii r and s), the ring $K_h := \overline{B(r_1 + h)} \setminus B(r_1)$ that is glued onto the interior disk $B(r_1)$ is the one with the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_h)$. Therefore, for $h > 0$ small enough, by the continuity of the first eigenvalue we have that

$$\lambda_1\big(\Omega \setminus (\overline{B(s)} \setminus B(r))\big) \leq \lambda(\Omega \setminus K_h) < \lambda(\Omega) + \delta.$$

This inequality combined with the definition of δ proves that any radially symmetric set cannot be optimal for problem (7). □

Remark 4.2. *If K^+ is the upper half-ring then the first eigenvalue of the open set $\Omega \setminus K^+$ is in fact the second eigenvalue of the whole ring (with a first eigenfunction such as $J_1(\omega r) + bY_1(\omega r))\sin\theta$). If we want this half-ring to be admissible, in the case $r_1 = 1$ the parameters r_0 and h must satisfy $h = (r_0 - 3)/2 + (r_0 - 1)/\pi$. Then if we require that $h \to 0$ (namely $r_0 \to (3\pi + 2)/(\pi + 2) \simeq 2.222$) we obtain that*

$$\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_h) \downarrow \lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_2(\Omega) = \lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K^+).$$

It is possible to verify numerically with Matlab and Bessel functions that with $r_1 = 1$, $r_0 = 2.25$, $h = 0.0229$, we obtain $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K_h) = 6.4554$ and $\lambda_1(\Omega \setminus K^+) = 6.6180$.

4.3. **Explicit solution in perforated domains.** We can collect Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3 to identify explicit solutions also for more general domains Ω.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $r_0 > 0$ and let $\{C_i\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoints open convex sets contained in Ω for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Let $\Omega = B(r_0) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k \overline{C_i}$ be an open disk of radius r_0 with k convex holes. There exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that if $L > \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega) - \alpha_0$ then problem (7) has a unique solution: the maximizer K_{opt} is*

given by the perforated disk $\overline{B(r)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i$ *concentric to* $B(r_0)$ *with* $r = L/(2\pi) - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}^1(C_i)/(2\pi)$.

Remark 4.3. *Usually finding explicit solutions to shape optimization problems is a very difficult task, and in all the successful situations they fall into customary classes: disks, rings, ellipsoids, squares, rectangles, triangles and so on. It is therefore interesting to notice that in Theorem 4.4 the explicit solution is provided by a set of not so notorious geometries.*

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, A. Colesanti and E. Villa, *Outer Minkowski content for some classes of closed sets*, Math. Ann. **342** (2008), 727–748.

[2] L. Ambrosio and P. Tilli, "Topics on analysis in metric spaces", Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.

[3] T. Briançon and J. Lamboley, *Regularity of the optimal shape for the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian with volume and inclusion constraints*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **26** (2009), 1149–1163.

[4] D. Bucur and G. Buttazzo, "Variational methods in shape optimization problems", Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, Birkhäuser, 2005.

[5] D. Bucur, G. Buttazzo and A. Henrot, *Minimization of* $\lambda_2(\Omega)$ *with a perimeter constraint*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58** (2009), 2709–2728.

[6] D. Bucur and J.P. Zolésio, *Boundary optimization under pseudo curvature constraint*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. **23** (1996), 681–699.

[7] R. Cerf, *The Hausdorff lower semicontinuous envelope of the length in the plane*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. **1** (2002), 33–71.

[8] A. Chambolle and C.J. Larsen, C^∞ *regularity of the free boundary for a two-dimensional optimal compliance problem*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **18** (2003), 77–94.

[9] A. El Soufi and R. Kiwan, *Extremal first Dirichlet eigenvalue of doubly connected plane domains and dihedral symmetry*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **39** (2007/08), 1112–1119.

[10] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, "Measure theory and fine properties of functions", Stud. Adv. Math., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992.

[11] H. Federer, "Geometric Measure Theory", Springer, Berlin, 1969.

[12] E. M. Harrell, II, P. Kröger, and K. Kurata, *On the placement of an obstacle or a well so as to optimize the fundamental eigenvalue*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **33** (2001), 240–259.

[13] A. Henrot, "Extremum problems for eigenvalues of elliptic operators", Frontiers in Mathematics, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006.

[14] A. Henrot, E. Oudet, *Minimizing the second eigenvalue of the Laplace operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **169** (2003), 73–87.

[15] A. Henrot and M. Pierre, "Variation et optimisation de formes", Mathématiques & Applications, Springer, Berlin, 2005.

[16] J. Hersch, *Contribution to the method of interior parallels applied to vibrating membrane*, In: "Studies in mathematical analysis and related topics", Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, 1962, 132–139.

[17] J. Hersch, *The method of interior parallels applied to polygonal or multiply connected membranes*, Pacific J. Math. **13** (1963), 1229–1238.

[18] D. Jerison, C. E. Kenig, *The inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem in Lipschitz domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **130** (1995), 161–219.

[19] S. Kesavan, *On two functionals connected to the Laplacian in a class of doubly connected domains*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **133** (2003), 617–624.

[20] J. Lamboley and A. Novruzi, *Polygons as optimal shapes with convexity constraint*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **48** (2009/10), 3003–3025.

[21] J. Lamboley, A. Novruzi and M. Pierre, *Regularity and singularities of optimal convex shapes in the plane*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **205** (2012), 311–343.

[22] A. Laurain, *Structure of shape derivatives in nonsmooth domains and applications*, Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. **15** (2005), 199–226.

[23] L.E. Payne and H.F. Weinberger, *Some isoperimetric inequalities for membrane frequencies and torsional rigidity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **2** (1961), 210–216.

[24] A.G. Ramm, P.N. Shivakumar, *Inequalities for the minimal eigenvalue of the Laplacian in an annulus*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **1** (1998), 559–563.
[25] V. Šverák, *On optimal shape design*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **72** (1993), 537–551.
[26] P. Tilli and D. Zucco, *Asymptotics of the first Laplace eigenvalue with Dirichlet regions of prescribed length*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **45** (2013), 3266–3282.
[27] P. Tilli and D. Zucco, *Where best to place a Dirichlet condition in an anisotropic membrane?*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **47** (2015), 2699–2721.
[28] E. Villa, *On the outer Minkowski content of sets*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **188** (2009), 619–630.

(A. Henrot) Institut Élie Cartan de Lorraine, UMR 7502 Université de Lorraine and CNRS, B.P. 70239, 54506 Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy, France
E-mail address: antoine.henrot@univ-lorraine.fr

(D. Zucco) Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche, Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi, 24, 10129 Torino, Italy
E-mail address: davide.zucco@polito.it